

Camp Navajo
Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)

Thursday, July 20, 2006
Coconino National Forest Office
1824 S. Thompson Street
Flagstaff, AZ

Minutes

Members in attendance:

Tom Britt, Community member
Shannon Clark, Coconino National Forest
Shaula Hedwall, USFWS
Christine Krosnicki, City of Flagstaff
Lee Luedeker, AGFD
Karen Underhill, Community member
Randy Wilkinson, NGB

Members absent:

Stacy Duffy, ADEQ
Glenn Morrison, Community member
LTC Pete Tosi, Camp Navajo

Interested Parties:

Gavin Fielding, ADEMA/AZARNG
Environmental
Carrie Marr, USFWS
Tom Parker, Camp Navajo
MAJ Brian Saunders, NGB

Guests:

Kim Harriz, AMEC
Dana Downs-Heimes, CH2MHill
Srinu Neralla, MKM Engineers
Marty Rozelle, The Rozelle Group, LTD.
Scott Veenstra, AMEC
Pat Wiegand, Brown & Caldwell
Pam Wilkinson, community member

The following acronyms may be used throughout this document

ADEMA	Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs
ADEQ	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
AGFD	Arizona Game & Fish Department
AZARNG	Arizona Army National Guard
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CDC	Contained Detonation Chamber
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
COPC	Contaminants of Potential Concern
EDMS	Electronic Data Management System
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
FOASA	Former Open Air Storage Area
FSP	Field Sampling Plan
FWPDBA	Former White Phosphorous Detonation and Burn Area (Chemical Canyon)
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
HERA	Human Health & Ecological Risk Assessment
LTM	Long Term Management
MAP	Management Action Plan
MD	Munitions Debris
MEC	Munitions and Explosives of Concern
MWP	Master Work Plan
NAAD	Navajo Army Depot
NAU	Northern Arizona University
NGB	National Guard Bureau

OB/OD	Open Burn/Open Detonation
ORS	Ordnance Related Scrap
PBC	Performance Based Contract
ppb	parts per billion
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RC	Response Complete
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
RIP	Remedy in Place
SAG	Stakeholder Advisory Group
SSHP	Site Safety and Health Plan
USACHPPM	U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WMM	Waste Military Munitions

The following matters were discussed, recommended, and/or decided.

1. *Welcome, Introductions and Announcements*

- Lee Luedeker chaired the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He announced that this SAG meeting was being held in the evening in Flagstaff to maximize access for the public. A news release announcing the meeting was sent to the local media.
- MAJ Brian Saunders introduced himself to the group. He is taking MAJ Myer's place and moved to the area from northern Virginia. His telephone number and address are the same as MAJ Myer's.
- Lee announced that Stacy Duffy could not attend this SAG meeting and sent her regrets
- Lee contacted Tom Britt and confirmed his interest in remaining on the SAG.

2. *Status of Removal Actions and Decision Documents*

Randy Wilkinson reviewed the overall closure strategy and status of specific sites and decision documents.

The CERCLA risk-based cleanup process is used to investigate, remediate, and close out all OB/OD Area sites. The chemical contamination issues are separated from the munitions and explosives of concern issues. The Decision Documents specifically address the chemical contamination issues. The MEC characterization is addressed more holistically across the OB/OD Area.

- Investigations have been completed at all sites.
- Removal actions are completed at five sites (NAAD 01, 03, 04, 05, 09C).
- A removal action is planned at one site (NAAD 02/09B).
- Two years of surface and ground water investigations have been completed.
- The second Mexican spotted owl survey is completed.
- The supplemental MEC characterization project is underway.
- Most sites have completed risk assessments or are under review. Jean Hanley of ADEQ is reviewing the human risk assessments, and the USFWS is reviewing the ecological risk assessments. The USACHPPM is reviewing the risk assessments for the Army on behalf of the U.S. Surgeon General.

The following table summarizes the status of all sites.

Site	Type	Fieldwork	Report/RSE	HRA	ERA	DD
01	IRP	Complete	Draft	—	Draft	
02	RCRA	IRA planned	Draft	Future	Future	
03	IRP	Complete	Final	—	Final	Draft
04	IRP	Complete	Final	—	Draft	
05	RCRA	Complete	Final	Future	Future	
06	RCRA	Complete	Final	Draft	Draft	
07	IRP	Complete	Final	Draft	Draft	
08A	IRP	Complete	Final	—	Final	
08B	RCRA	Complete	Final	Final	Final	Draft
09A	IRP	Complete	Final	—	Final	
09C	RCRA	Complete	Final	—	—	Final
09D	RCRA	Complete	Final	—	Final	Draft
10	IRP	Complete	Final	—	Final	Draft
13	RCRA	Complete	Final	Final	Draft	Draft
20	IRP	Complete	Final	Final	Draft	Draft
E76	IRP	Complete	Draft	—		

Randy emphasized that the decision documents are the most current and concise summaries for each site. Each document includes: a description of the site - historical and current operations; the environmental setting; a summary of the investigations; the regulatory basis for the determination; site risks and response decision; public involvement activities; and a declaration about the need for further action.

Decision documents that are out for public comment are shown in the table below. They are being reviewed concurrently by ADEQ. The NGB attorney is reviewing the RCRA sites (08B and 09D). The Army Environmental Center attorneys are reviewing the DDs for NAADs 03 and 10.

Site	Site Name	Public Comment Period (2006)
03	Former White Phosphorous Detonation and Burn Area	June 26 - July 26
08B	Former Open Burn Area	July 17 – August 16
09D	Current Open Burn Area	July 17 – August 16
10	Pad #3	July 30 – August 29

ADEQ will hold their comments until the end of the public comment periods, because they will want to know how the NGB will address the comments. The final DDs will be posted to the EDMS website.

3. MEC Characterization Project Update

The MEC characterization activities are divided into three main components: primary source; secondary source; and munitions debris assessment.

Primary source areas are those in which MEC may be found as a concentrated mass, such as former detonation pits, trenches, earthen mounds or other burial features

NAAD 01 – 9 excavations planned

NAAD 02 – 11 excavations planned

NAAD 03 – geophysical survey completed, excavation planned

NAAD 20 – 2 excavations planned

Carrie Marr asked whether or not NGB was collecting soil samples. Randy responded that the focus of this project is to look at acute hazards related to explosive risks. Previous investigations were scoped to address chemical contamination, and risk assessments have been conducted based on those results. Earlier investigations found little, if any, soil contamination. However, a contingency fund is available if something unexpected is found.

Carrie also asked if contamination from MEC occurs in an area for which a “response complete” is approved, how will it be addressed? Randy said that the risk assessments evaluated current site conditions. One of the objectives is to predict the rate of release. We know the number of MEC. So once we know the release rate, we will have a better idea of the possibility of future contamination. The EPA is developing a hazard assessment methodology that will be out for comment in the fall of 2006.

Secondary source areas are found where MEC potentially has been scattered over a wide area as a result of “kick-outs” during detonation activities.

To investigate MEC and munitions debris distribution, a grid cell pattern with a dimension of 200 by 200-feet was superimposed over all NAAD interior map surfaces and the area extending beyond the NAAD boundaries. The distance to extend the grid cell boundary was determined by calculating the greatest distance a fragment would be thrown, from the largest munition detonated at that particular NAAD site. This boundary represents the furthest extent to which characterization activities will be conducted, and will be confirmed during the MEC characterization activities. The distance and boundaries for NAAD 02 and NAAD 03 overlap in many areas, and as such, will be investigated as one boundary.

NAAD 01 – 63 of 96 grids have been surveyed

NAAD 02/03 – 51 of 102 grids surveyed

NAAD 20 – 0 of 0 grids surveyed

All the effort is focused on Sites 01 and 02/03 before the monsoon season hits. 55 people are on the ground and have to sit in cars if lightening is present. A Quality Control team resurveys a portion of each grid. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provides quality assurance directly to the NGB. They randomly walk across 10% of all grids.

These sites are also being surveyed for distribution of **munitions debris**.

NAAD 01 – 40 of 40 grids surveyed

NAAD 02/03 – 57 of 57 grids surveyed

NAAD 20 – 0 of 32 grids surveyed

Other Activities

Some munitions casings are being collected to assess the rate of corrosion, so as to better understand the potential for future releases of explosive compounds.

ADEQ has agreed in writing for an exemption from the 90-day rule for storage of hazardous waste. A quarterly report to ADEQ provides an inventory of munitions items in storage.

4. *Call to the public*

No one spoke.

5. *Action Items and Next Meetings*

The next meetings will be Thursday, October 12, 2006, and January 11, 2007 at 10 AM at Camp Navajo. There were no action items.